

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
MONDAY, DECEMBER 8, 2014 7:00 P.M.**

Members Present: Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner, Stellato, Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner

Members Absent: Lewis

Others Present: Mayor Raymond Rogina; Mark Koenen, City Administrator; Rita Tungare, Director of Community & Economic Development; Russell Colby, Planning Division Manager; Chris Tiedt, Development Engineering Division Manager; Bob Vann, Building & Code Enforcement Division Manager; Matthew O'Rourke, Economic Development Division Manager; Ellen Johnson, Planner; Fire Chief Schelstreet; Asst. Fire Chief Christensen

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was convened by Chairman Stellato at 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Stellato welcomed the High School students.

2. ROLL CALLED

Roll was called:

Present: Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner, Stellato, Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner

Absent: Lewis

Chairman Stellato stated there was a request to move item 3b. to first on the agenda due to some updates given to Aldr. Bancroft by the developer. Aldr. Bancroft stated that he and Firethorne Apartments had spoken a couple of times last week in regard to the proposed entry way which would directly access the apartment community from Dean St. He said this was proposed to the Plan Commission where they received feedback from local residents and after a few discussions with him it was agreed that there should be a few more community meetings. He said the developer issued a letter which stated that at the Plan Commission public hearing a few adjacent neighbors expressed apprehension about the proposed change and that the client would like to meet with those neighbors to have further discussions to address any concerns. Aldr. Bancroft said he feels that is the right move on their part and staff agreed that the time would be well spent to have people sit down for that. Chairman Stellato said it is always a good thing when the neighbors can sit and talk with the developers.

3. COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

b. Recommendation to approve an Amendment to Special Use for PUD and

Minor Change to PUD for the Firethorne Apartments, 1320-1370 Brook St. (Firethorne PUD).

Aldr. Bessner made a motion to move item 3b. to the front of the agenda and to also table that item until further notice. Seconded by Aldr. Bancroft. No additional discussion. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion carried. 8-0

a. Presentation of a Concept Plan for Lexington Club.

Chairman Stellato stated that this item is a Concept Plan and that there would be no formal vote taken; it is just to accept testimony, hear comments and allow the developer to hear those same comments and questions as well. He said he knows this was thoroughly discussed at Plan Commission but that the developer was looking to hear what other comments would come forward from both the Committee members and the audience.

Bill Rotolo-Vice President Lexington Homes- stated that they presented the proposed new plan to the Plan Commission which addressed what they think are market conditions that were not favorable to the approved plan.

Jon Nelson-Jen Land Design- 632 S. Scoville, Oak Park-stated that the current approved plan, which is zoned and final engineered, reflects two zoning categories: RM-2 for the western portion and a portion of the south-east end of the site, and RT-3 in the north-east portion of the site. He said the current approved project is for 130-units with 102 of those units townhomes or attached single-family units in the RM-2 zone, and the balance in the north-east corner is for 28 single-family in the RT-3. He said the site had certain conditions as part of the approval which included some off-site conditions for 9th St., 7th St., and various sidewalk and street improvements, and the creek along the southern property line was preserved and integrated as part of the overall development. He said there were future accesses west to 12th St. along with pedestrian accesses both to the north and to the park site, and all were conditions of the overall approval for the PUD. He said the new proposal consists of rezoning the entire site for all single-family detached development that will require the site to be downzoned in intensity to RT-3, with 112-single-family detached lots, with a minimum lot width of 42 ft., minimum area of 4,284 sq. ft., and with a typical lot of 4,620 ft. He said the yard standards are sort of a hybrid which is partially what was approved under the current RT-3 zone, but they are now proposing 5 ft. side yards on each side, 20 ft. front yard and 25 ft. rear yard for all single-family product. He said the site plan road pattern is substantially the same as the approved plan with only minor deviations; the only primary exception being the road stub that was proposed to 12th St. He said the road stub has been relocated from Ryan St. to the north, which is being shown as to how it could extend, but there is some detail associated with that that needs to still be worked out as far as access points and engineering. He said all of the open spaces have been preserved, the road pattern is essentially the same, drainage is the same, and pedestrian connections are the same and future accesses have all been accommodated. He noted there are some off-site conditions that would still be adhered to; he just didn't show them on the Concept Plan because it's a detail.

Mr. Nelson stated that when the plan was presented the Plan Commission, it was essentially a unified lot plan of 42 ft. wide and a certain type of architecture associated with that. He said there were comments received from both the Commission and the audience in terms of generating more diversity, both in terms of the type of product and also the lot width. He said

the site is difficult in that the way the site final engineers, as there are a substantial amount of lots that will have “look out” or “walk out”, which means the grade drops from front to back, which also means that a large percentage of the lots work best with a front-oriented garage. He stated that there are options for certain areas of the site where it’s flatter that some more creative things can be done; but that the site has not been analyzed in its entirety, but they did create an exhibit which was in response to the comments heard at Plan Commission. He said those comments included that the developer try to emulate some of the characteristics that exist in the neighborhood; which includes detached garages, various set-backs and different size houses etc.

He said there are some opportunities to do several things:

- 1) Interior and corner lots with strong front to rear grade drop would have front oriented garages.
- 2) Interior or corner lots could have attached or detached garages depending on preference of the buyer.

He said all the details have not been worked out but the developer wanted to demonstrate that they received substantial amount of comments and they want to show how those may be integrated by product and in terms of the site plan.

Aldr. Payleitner asked if the home buyer would choose their plan or would they be restricted by which lot they choose. Mr. Nelson said there will be certain restrictions to the type of detail based on grade; for example if a buyer wanted a detached garage, there will be certain locations that can accommodate that.

Aldr. Turner asked if they were planning to work with the environment as is and not level the site. Mr. Nelson said yes, the site has been final engineered, but the lines drops substantially on properties to the north, west to east and the creek. He said there is quite a bit going on and in looking at how that then translates into grading each individual lot, certain areas require the lot to be lower in the back with either a look out, half the grade being exposed or a full walk-out and others that would be uphill or on the down side slope that could be more flat. He said in and of itself to engineer the site to relate to the surrounding property requires restrictions on how to put product on those pads.

Aldr. Bessner said in regard to the interior side yard being a minimum of 5 ft., that the sheet states a 1 ft. minimum to 10 ft. total and asked if that were a variance. Mr. Nelson said no that would have been the departure; originally they had thought about doing a zero lot line but it creates issues with the building code, engineering issues and utility easements. He said that has now been changed to a more traditional 5 ft. and 5 ft.

Charles Murphy-805 Manley Rd.- asked if the developer feels they have a finished grade at this point or if they thought they would have any impact with the remedial process or the impact of the grade with the remedial activity that has to go on. John Agenlian-Lexington Homes-1731 Marcey St. Chicago-said the site has a lot of grade change from north to south and west to east; it falls off from the north toward the south and falls from the west toward the east with a creek that runs along the southern end as well as the former railroad tracks to the north. He said as far as the remediation, there are some well-known environmental issues and there is some dirt that has to be removed and dealt with; but the crux of the grading on the site is meeting the existing grades at the perimeter and all the existing grades along all property lines have to be met. He

said all the connection points with 6th and 7th St. need to be met; so there will be a lot of earth work done as well as changing the grades on the site and removing the concrete slabs, but at the end of the day there is still a lot of grade change from the north to south and from the west to the east.

David Amundson-500 Cedar St.-said this is a huge improvement and it makes his heart go pitter patter but that he questions if what is being seen is part of the plan or if this is more of a menu and everyone could choose a front loading garage because they do not want the alternatives, which would be the plan that was shown a couple weeks ago at Plan Commission. Mr. Rotolo said they put every possibility on the exhibit so it is not totally real in the sense that this is not the way it would be sold; however every buyer will be shown the possibilities and they will decide what they want to do. He said there are only a certain number of lots that there can be detached garages on because you cannot put them on a walk-out or a look-out due to expenses, and that he hopes a number of buyers will choose detached but to be honest most buyers will probably prefer an attached garage. He said when the site plan is submitted for public hearing a lot of these questions will be answered and there will be a percentage of certain kinds of lots spread throughout the land of where they are engineering feasible.

Aldr. Turner said Mark St. is shown as a straight shot in the plan. Mr. Rotolo said correct; there was a comment in the staff report and in the original plan that at 9th there would be a belly in the road for traffic calming, but that is still something that needs to be looked at as a detail in between the concept and preliminary. He said he is not sure if it will wind up the same but he thinks there is a concern that now it is even straighter and some appropriate traffic calming techniques would need to be looked at. Aldr. Turner said he could tell right now that it would turn into a raceway, so anything to bump it out or curve it to slow the traffic would be appreciated. Mr. Rotolo said yes, that was a staff comment and he was glad Aldr. Turner caught it.

Aldr. Lemke said it's not apparent from the aerial photo how access would be made to 12th St. Mr. Rotolo said 12th St. would not have access off of this plan and as it's built the access to 12th St. is a provision on the original PUD that was shown to come through the southern end of the adjacent factory building. He said the assumption is that a connection to 12th St. should be provided in the future at such time as the current use redevelops; so that connection cannot be made and they would modify the detail to provide the right-of-way and not the full improvement, so there would not end up with a road running into the back of the industrial. Aldr. Lemke asked if there were a drop off toward the back of the street with half or full outs in back, because that seems surprising because going under the 12th St. viaduct you see the former railroad right-of-way is quite a bit above the street level. Mr. Rotolo said the old railroad line in that location is elevated but drops from north to south; but conversely the Lexington property is high and also drops down toward that, which is where the variation and grade comes in and the relationship is not directly to the tracks but is along the property line. Aldr. Lemke asked if one could say there is a swale there; or something to that effect. Mr. Rotolo said yes.

Joe Sabin-BSB Design-1540 E. Dundee, Palatine-showed a diagram to explain the streetscape and architecture. He said lots 1 & 2 are the typical footprint that was originally proposed; 30 ft. wide floor plans with the garage forward with a variety of elevations to create a streetscape. He said the perspective showing the original concept shows a variety of a lifestyles for the market with homes from 1,400 sq. ft. up to slightly north of 2,500 sq. ft. hopefully getting to 3,000 sq.

ft., which would include a couple of ranch plans, master down plans and 2-story plans. He said the current plan shows garage forward but they would like to create the architecture that's part of the garage and part of the house and what they have done is built out over the garage with detailing to really create it as a feature. He said they would be using a variety of materials; brick, stone, accent siding and detailing in the gable, accent siding with horizontal siding. He said some of the comments from the Plan Commission and neighbors were that they were really looking for more variety, and even in the case of the garages being forward, they are relying on the architecture of the elevations to help give that variety. He said the spacing of the plans consists of 42 ft. wide lots with massing and roof lines varying from elevation to elevation with shallow pitched roofs, taller gables and hip roofs all to give a little bit of roof bounce as it goes down the street, with a couple of side load garages for variety to the elevation and that all the different models would have a nice mix of quality materials with a variety of garage door placement to add some interest to the elevations.

Aldr. Payleitner said she understands that the elevation will restrict what model is chosen on what lot and in being on the consumer end of this type of a subdivision, she knows there are rules as to not having the same colors in a row but as far as model type, there were no restrictions; and she wanted to know if the builder had those safety features built in to ensure variety. Mr. Rotolo said typically each one of their plans would have 3 or 4 elevations each, so they would attract a different market; but that yes there is always an internal monotony code that usually is more extensive than the municipalities and since this is a PUD, the Committee could interject their concerns. He said they do not like that either and they have built 40,000 houses in the metro area and in looking at those subdivisions, they have withstood the test of time very well and have a lot of variety in elevations. Chairman Stellato explained to the high school students that a PUD (Planned Unit Development) gives the city a lot more control of development and that he appreciated Mr. Rotolo's comment on the interjecting of the PUD to protect the monotony code because it was going to be his next question.

Aldr. Silkaitis asked if they would have basements. Mr. Rotolo said yes, standard.

Aldr. Bancroft asked how many lots are flat sides versus sides with grade where you might have a look-out or walk-out. Mr. Rotolo said that's a tough question but that the engineer thought that about 20% of the lots were flatter and the rest would be some sort of walk-out or look-out; which is a big percentage for a typical subdivision, because Chicago is typically much flatter than that but that this site is not. Mr. Agenlian said as they design and further the engineering process that would be buttoned up; at this time now it is 10-20% and they would try to make as many as flat as possible but from north to south and west to east there is a lot of grade change on the site; but the more flat lots the better for them and that's always their goal.

Aldr. Bessner asked how many elevations of the front load garage would be offered. Mr. Safin said throughout the series of homes they would identify 6-different styles but those would be applied to the massing of the plan; so 3-4 elevations may be created for one plan but would be across the 6-styles. Aldr. Bessner said out of all those elevations per model, would the minimum one be enhanced to take away some of the garage mass that's in the front. Mr. Safin said each plan would have its own layout with themed elevation: Craftsman, Prairie and English Country to apply the style to the elevation using the detailing cues that are found in those traditional styles and apply that to the elevation. Aldr. Bessner asked if a lot of the base elevation models with the garage in the front were sold, would some of the enhancements to take away the garage

mass be lost. Mr. Rotolo said they are offering 6 different sizes of homes and each of those sizes will look very different, and in each of those 6, there will be 3 or 4 themed elevations so the permutations and combinations are pretty large. He said in their experience most people do not want a small home, but some of those will be sold at 1,400 sq. ft. and would move up from there based on their income or financial capability, but that it usually ends up fairly even along the spectrum, but the monotony code will also take care of that.

Mr. Rotolo stated that they were finished with their presentation and that if there were any traffic questions their consultant was present. He reiterated that garage doors with the driveways in the front will have a huge variety of detail, colors and styles because they are being real sensitive to that so they do not look the same. He made one final comment stating that the surrounding neighborhood as far as its variety in house, style, size, price and orientation was built over more than 100-years and they cannot recreate that; but they can create a lot more variety than the typical subdivision and that is their goal. He said they have completely changed their plan from 102 townhomes and 28 single family homes to 112 single family homes which are on smaller lots than usual and the densities are very similar to the adjoining neighborhood; about 4-units to the acre which is not dense.

Kim Malay-526 S. 16th St.-thanked the developer for the major improvement from the original approved plan but she wanted to know what the percentage would be for each of the 4 lot sizes in comparison to all 42 ft., to get an idea of the variety would be like. She also asked which age bracket these would be geared toward because there are still issues on the west side in regard to the schools and last she had spoken to the developer she was told that they would be gearing toward the 55+ range. Mr. Rotolo said he cannot yet answer the lot sizes but it would be resolved before they submit the plans and it would be discussed with staff ahead of time; but it clearly is different from the original plan which were mostly 42's except for the corners, which were a bit larger. He said there would now be more variety and they would need to look at it very closely and mesh the engineering with the lot sizes and types, but they had not done that yet because they did not want to waste the time and money until after they heard from Committee. He said in terms of the demographic of who the buyer is, they do offer a ranch plan, 2-master down plans which are geared to older buyers and would be lots that would not have big giant yards. He said but yes, there would be families with children, but he thinks a lot fewer than a typical single-family subdivision, and these homes will not be cheap, with approaching \$400,000 he thinks young families with children have a lot of other options within the city that have bigger yards. He said these will not be maintenance free, they will be typical homeowner maintained and he thinks it will be older buyers in the main but there will also be younger buyers, but he does not know the mix yet; they have only done a market study.

Aldr. Bancroft asked why the decision not to go maintenance free. Mr. Rotolo said it's typically not done with single-family detached; the buyers do not like the added cost due to being able to qualify for a bigger house without it. Aldr. Bancroft asked if they would offer a single story residence. Mr. Rotolo said two, and then a 2 story but with the master downstairs, which appeals to an older buyer.

Aldr. Payleitner asked what the rough price range would be. Mr. Rotolo said the market study showed an average price of around \$430,000 and he thinks they would try to open up at about \$389,000-\$394,000 and go up from there.

Aldr. Bancroft asked what the study showed for absorption period. Mr. Rotolo said he wished it were better but around 2 per month, which is pretty slow. He said the market is better than what it was but it is not recovered; this year in Chicago metro about 6,000 new homes will have been built and before the recession there were 35,000-40,000 homes being built.

Aldr. Lemke asked if this would be done in some phasing as to not have one on each side and then a second on each side. Mr. Rotolo said they always build in sequence and he believes they will probably mass grade the entire site all at once with maybe 20 some units and models. Aldr. Lemke said he did notice the Plan Commissions comments regarding the variety of architecture and consistency with the neighborhood and he feels the developer has done that more or less and he feels good about that but he is not sure how well the massing is answered; and it seems there is some opportunity in size of lots for the occasional buyer who might like a wider lot. He said he saw one plan that opened up toward the back that may appeal to some buyers and that would give the developer the opportunity to address the size of lots issue; but on the balance this seems like a much better plan.

David Amundson-500 Cedar St.-thanked the developers for their thought and reaction to incorporating feedback from the community and that the public meeting had with the neighborhood was awesome and a lot of his hopes and aspirations have been met; if they actually build in some diversity in the size of the homes and more in terms of styles to be similar with the neighborhood. He said one thing that had not been addressed that he would really like to see happen is the connection to the Timbers by 6th St. and that it wouldn't take much to put some sort of bridge through there. He said that railroad track is going to be rails to trails and it needs to be prepared for by setting aside a right-of-way so that when 6th St. goes north it's there, because if a house is built there it will never happen and a huge opportunity will be missed. He said what is currently being shown is a little access to the future rails to trails that is sort of between 2 homes and he thinks for someone who does not live in this development it will not feel as though they have right to it because they would be walking within 10 ft. of someone's house to get to the bike trail. He said if it were made more public where the access to the bike trail is off a public street that connects through the Timbers and then everyone could use it, it makes sense people on the trail would be more likely to filter down in to the neighborhood and people from the neighborhood would be more likely to filter into the trail. He said it would also solve the problem of having a development with only 1-exit and this is the one and only chance ever to fix that problem; and if it's an issue with the Fire Dept. for Firethorne it should also be an issue for Timbers and this is a nice easy clean way to do it. He said he would still like to see more diversity in terms of set-backs and maybe a little greater diversity in terms of lot sizes and he has done some thinking and the only place he thinks any advantage that could be gained is if something creative is done in terms of code with stormwater detention and retention. He said they are losing 1/3 of their site to water which means by default to get the unit count they want things are pretty compact, and if a creative solution could be come up with together, it would buy them more land to use which maybe in exchange ups their unit count a little bit and does them a favor; but in doing the city a favor it would also allow for increased lot sizes or allows for an even greater diversity in lot sizes. He said cisterns and bio swales are a possibility and he has had conversations with Kane County water management people and there is some flexibility in the code that requires everybody thinking creatively and not just applying the same blasted solutions that have been done for generations and he feels if there is any one place that merits doing something creative it's this site; this development could be transformational for the town and get us noticed on a national scale. He said if at all possible he would like to see a little more

attention to the 2007 CPA that states the historical styles recognized in St. Charles, and it would be nice to see a little more of that incorporated in terms of our own vernacular, which recalls our own heritage because the neighborhood is all about heritage. He said it would be nice to have whatever goes in new sort of pay homage to be a little more authentic in its looking backwards and this is an awesome start and that they should continue to dialog.

Charles Murphy-805 Manley Rd. in the Timbers said any suggestion to have any ingress into the Timbers through the Lexington development is a mistake and as he reviews the residential land use policies and the Comprehensive Plan it states “the preservation of the character of the city’s existing single-family residential neighborhoods because they are unique and distinct”. He said the Timbers is unique and distinct because of its 1-entrance which is a controlling point for traffic and quality of life; there is not 1-speedway road coming through and the reason he moved in 20-something years ago was because of the park district access, trails to the Wildrose School and it’s a safe environment with not a long of strangers entering the community due to having the 1-access. He said he feels it would be a conflict of the preservation of the character to one of the city’s existing single-family residential neighborhoods; the Lexington Club will have its own multiple ingress and egress, and he is not even sure how they would enter into the Timbers with the industrial park, the train bridge single car width and even traffic from the Sportsplex, and he is not even sure how Mark St. could even be extended on to 12th St. without having a real traffic conflict, even with the abandonment of the industrial use. He said there was a comment made by staff regarding the Mark St. extension stating that it would have some impact on the industrial development and he is not sure what that means because they have a PUD as well which has kind of come to a stop and that is a current issue as well due to the economy tanking that. He said he feels the Timbers access is a no-go and he would appreciate the consideration to covenant or agree that will not happen because they maintain and appreciate the seclusion and the security they have.

Aldr. Silkaitis said he likes the new plan better but his concern is that out of 10-things listed 8 of them need variances, with the biggest one being the maximum building coverage of 25% and the developer is asking for 45%. He said he would like to see wider lots and a variety of lot sizes, something closer to 25% versus 45%; but otherwise he is content with it.

Aldr. Turner said he read that Public Works would like more than 10 ft. between the houses and he knows that’s the zoning, but he kind of agrees with that with houses having this amount of square footage with 45% coverage of the lot. He said they will either need to increase the lot size, which would be preferable, and he has a little problem with the density, to give public works more room, and his other concern is to curb or loop Mark St. as to calm the traffic on the street.

Aldr. Bancroft said he agrees with Aldr. Silkaitis and Aldr. Turner and from a density standpoint the more creative with the rear loaded garages and the more the appearance can be changed to have it look less dense is an important feature and the developer needs to be committed to that as opposed to having it in a book of plans to show people; he thinks he would be a little bit more circumspect about the developers position to commit. He said from a density standpoint there is the practical stuff that Public Works wants and needs and then just the appearance of density, which he thinks is just as big a problem with this plan as anything else.

Aldr. Martin agreed with Aldr. Bancroft's comments regarding the lot size and density; he would like to see bigger lots and fewer houses, but a good job was done on revising the plan. He referenced page 11-comments from staff concerning some agreements made with the developer back in January, and those are not reflected in the current request. He said there are 6-items listed in the staff report including the \$200,000 contribution; and he wondered if those items were still intact with no changes. Mr. Rotolo said they were not going to be changed.

Adlr. Krieger said she agreed that she would like to see a few fewer houses with larger lots with larger homes that will probably or most likely have families, and Mark St. must empty on to 5th or 6th St. with the other entrance and access points.

Aldr. Bessner said he thinks it's a great plan based on the topography of the site as well as how it will do the best to intertwine with the current residential homes here. He stressed emphasis on the interior side loads and the front loads to prevent any monotony if a base elevation is continuously used. He said the developer stated that they are trying to take away from the garages being a focal point being that everything is a little tight, but he is not sure how the process will work if future home buyers have their choice of elevation and he would like to see that be prevented.

Chairman Stellato said he thinks the audience is lighter tonight is due to the land use change and he does not want to speak for everyone but he knows he is more comfortable with the single-family development as opposed to the mixed use that was there. He said as you go through the geometry and lay out the lots, the density may drop anyway because in order to get some diversity of lots and fulfill the monotony code, there will end up being a little bit fewer homes and he is curious to see the next site plan layout as they put the protractor to the development. He said the \$200,000 outside improvement on the traffic is a concern regarding the road widths and how they would handle the development; but all in all he thinks the developer has received a nod from Committee to move forward and come back again at some point. He said for people in the audience or neighbors he would expect to see this item again in the first quarter of 2015 so to probably set their calendars for February to come back and receive more information.

Aldr. Silkaitis asked if the Inclusionary Housing would not apply to this development. Chairman Stellato said he believes the staff report was under study to be sure that if the city has not met the standard minimum. Aldr. Silkaitis clarified that its 25% but it has to drop down to 15% before it would have to apply. Mr. Colby said when the PUD Ordinance was approved, the developer was granted a deviation from the code requirement for Inclusionary Housing, where there is an agreement that states that if they try to pursue grant funding and actively do so that would constitute compliance with the Ordinance. He said as its proposed now, they would have the ability that if that condition remains when the project is amended, they could continue to follow through with that agreement, or they could alternately follow the city's code requirements and depending on what the percentage is at the time, there may or may not be a requirement.

- c. Recommendation to approve an Ordinance Amending Chapter 12.40 of the City Code "City Corridor Improvement Program".

Mr. O'Rourke said the Corridor Commission had been contemplating some changes over the last several months and they are proposing to tweak the eligible properties that are considered for grant funding within the code. He said the conversation was started when it was asked that if

someone along a key area of town wanted to do something, could the Corridor Commission help. Through staff conversation it was realized there are probably some pretty key areas that are not included. He said the Corridor Commission program is currently set up to not include Route 31 and Route 25, and the proposal in front of committee is to basically create some key gateway areas as defined on maps to amend the program to make those prominent areas eligible should the opportunity arise to enhance them.

Aldr. Silkaitis asked if, since we are talking about expanding the program, would the dollar amount be expanded as well, because he thinks the money would be gone through quicker. Mr. O'Rourke said reviewing that amount is part of the budget process each year but he does not anticipate any increases in the budget due to this proposal; it's more in case an opportunity comes up. Aldr. Silkaitis asked if the money has ever run out before the end of budget year. Mr. O'Rourke said not in years past, but this current year all the funds have been guaranteed to various property owners. He said they have not all been reimbursed yet because the work is not done, but the funding is done for this fiscal year ending April 30, 2014.

Aldr. Turner asked if the areas were outside of city limits. Mr. O'Rourke said no, it's all in the city limits, it's just those key areas where people come from outside into the city.

Aldr. Krieger said she has concerns regarding some of the landscaping and the placing of signage for visibility as you are coming into the city. She said one of the worst intersections is Division and Rt. 25 making a left off of Division on to Rt. 25 you cannot see a thing as you look north and she feels that the people making these decisions are driving large trucks and they need to be more careful about this and some of the landscaping that the city has supported needs to have more awareness toward sight issues.

Aldr. Turner made a motion to approve an Ordinance Amending Chapter 12.40 of the City Code "City Corridor Improvement Program". Seconded by Aldr. Bancroft. No additional discussion. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion carried. 8-0

4. **ADDITIONAL BUSINESS-None.**

5. **ADJOURNMENT - Aldr. Bessner made a motion to adjourn at 8:09PM. Motion was seconded by Aldr. Turner. No additional discussion. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion carried.**